

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the present Amendment and the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 27-34 are pending. Claims 1-6 were cancelled previously, and Claims 8-26 have been cancelled by this amendment. Claims 27-34 have been added by this amendment. No new matter has been added.

In the office action, claims 7-12, 19-22, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Eiji; and claims 13-18; 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eiji in view of Ito.

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify the structure of the spring mechanism. The new claims recite Applicant's structure with additional detail. In particular, paragraphs (a) – (d) of newly presented independent claim 27 provide support for the two "whereby clauses" contained in paragraphs (e) and (f). Those "whereby clauses" indicate that, by way of non-limiting examples, Applicant's brake shoe portion 50 tilts in one direction when the applicable sheave 1 or 6 is rotated in one direction and tilts in the opposite direction when the applicable sheave 1 or 6 is rotated in the other direction. Basically, the lost-motion cooperation of the two king pins 5f1 and 5f2 with the two second support holes 5k1 and 5k2 and the lost-motion cooperation of the pin 5m with the first support hole 5n permit the brake shoe portion 50 and the pair of spring mechanism 51 and 52 to both (1) tilt in either direction and (2) either compress or expand, depending on which way the applicable sheave 1 or 6 is being rotated by the wire rope 2—which means depending on whether the car 3 and the counterweight 4 are ascending or descending.

It is respectfully submitted that Eiji does not show structure responding to that definition or the additional limitations added to independent claim 7 and that no combination of the structure shown in Eiji with the structure shown in Ito would respond to that definition.

Application No. 10/565,970
Reply to Office Action of January 2, 2008

While both references show emergency brakes for elevators, neither shows an emergency brake for elevators having the desirable characteristic possessed by Applicant's invention. See page 7 line 1-21.

In view of the foregoing an early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Charles L. Gholz
Registration No. 26,395

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)